

Fugett, Joy L.

From: Fugett, Joy L.
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2017 3:22 PM
To: Downs, Brian
Subject: House Bill 1703 Feedback from Julie

FYI – Julie’s Feedback

From: Cox-Kain, Julie
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2017 2:44 PM
To: Fugett, Joy L.
Subject: House Bill 1703

Joy, Since the requirement to do this work is dependent upon the legislature appropriating funds for this specific purpose we don’t have a major issue. I will point out, however, there is an almost identical statute (Alternatives to Abortion) that immediately precedes the numbering provided in the Choosing Childbirth Act. At that time the legislature established the Alternatives to Abortion fund and appropriated money for deposit into the fund under a line item appropriation until SFY 2009. I had our legal Counsel assess the bill against the existing statute and he found the following:

The basis in state law for the use of the Alternatives to Abortion revolving account funds are almost identical to the work the organizations are to do under the Choosing Childbirth Act (in fact the Choosing Childbirth Act is located at the end of the Alternatives to Abortion portion of the statutes). Below is a side by side comparison of each program:

Alternative to Abortion Fund

1. Medical care;
for duration of pregnancy
2. Nutritional services;
3. Housing assistance;
4. Adoption services;
5. Educational and employment assistance,
assistance; and
6. Child care assistance; and
support services.
7. Parenting education and support services.

Choosing Childbirth Act

1. Provide Medical Attention
2. Nutritional Support Services
3. Housing Assistance
4. Adoption Services
5. Education and employment
6. Parenting education and

The major difference between the two is that the Alternative to Abortion Funds go directly to the non-profit who provide the “alternatives-to-abortion services” (see 63 O.S. Sec. 1-740.11 (A), while under the Choosing Childbirth Act the monies would go to the “grant-supervising entity” to grant the money to the non-profit.

